



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,212	11/01/2005	Josef Guttenbrunner	P/3240-104	6755
2352	7590	11/15/2007		
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN			EXAMINER	
1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS			LIN, ING HOUR	
NEW YORK, NY 100368403				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/552,212

Applicant(s)

GUTTENBRUNNER ET AL.

Examiner

Ing-Hour Lin

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 October 2005 and 21 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/06/05.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13, and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheurecker (US 4,164,252) in view of Eberwein (US 2004/0035549).

Scheurecker (col. 2, lines 17+) substantially teaches the claimed strand-guiding roll for supporting and guiding cast metal strands in a continuous casting installation, , comprising: a central rotatable shaft 1; at least one roll shell or roll bodies 5 locked to the shaft by each feather key 5 for preventing the relative rotation between the at least one roll shell or roll bodies 5 and the shaft and bearing housings 14 provided with a duct 15 through which a cooling agent flow.

Scheurecker fails to teach the use of an annular space formed between the shaft and the roll shell and delimited by support rings.

However, Eberwein (paragraphs 20+) teaches the use of an annular space 1c formed between the shaft and the roll shell and delimited by support rings 10, 11 for the purpose of effectively connecting the water feed and discharge fittings on the water clamping plate 14 and cooling the longitudinal channel 2a, 2b between the roll shell 3 and sleeve 2 supported on the shaft 1 (paragraphs 20+). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Scheurecker the use an annular space formed between the shaft and the roll shell and delimited by support rings as taught by Eberwein in order to effectively connect the water feed and discharge fittings on the water clamping plate 14 and cool the longitudinal channel 2a, 2b between the roll shell 3 and sleeve 2 supported on the shaft 1 (Eberwein, paragraphs 20+).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, Scheurecker in view of Eberwein fails to teach the use of opposite ends of the shaft served as connections of the water feed and discharge fittings. However, the use of opposite ends of the shaft served as connections of the water feed and discharge fittings would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art in order to provide an alternative but effective cooling distribution to the roll shells.

4. Claims 2, 7, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheurecker (US 4,164,252) in view of Eberwein (US 2004/0035549) as applied to claims 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13, and 15-16 above and further in view of Giertz (US 7,165,891).

Scheurecker in view of Eberwein fails to teach the use of sealing elements. However, Giertz (col. 2, lines 58+) teaches the use of sealing elements such as ring-shaped seal 8 and retaining ring 15 for the purpose of effectively sealing the roll and supporting ring and the shaft

(col. 3, lines 1+). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Scheurecker in view of Eberwein the use of sealing elements as taught by Kraklau in order to effectively cool seal the roll and supporting ring and the shaft (Giertz, col. 3, lines 1+).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ing-Hour Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1180. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-5:30).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jonathan Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JHL

I.-H. Lin

11/8/07


Jonathan Johnson
SPE Au1793